REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated July 14, 2009 in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b).

As indicated above, claims 1 and 5-7 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendment is unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 1 claims an apparatus for processing an image signal, claim 5 claims a method therefore, claim 6 claims a computer-readable medium and claim 7 claims a program. The apparatus, method, medium and program include converting a first image signal, constituted by plural items of pixel data, into a second image constituted of plural items of pixel data. Plural items of pixel data, located respectively in a time directional periphery and a space directional periphery with respect to a target position in a second image, are selected based on a plurality of frames stored in a plurality of frame memory portions. The data selection includes selecting plural items of pixel data located in the space directional periphery with respect to first positions before and after a current frame obtained by performing motion compensation on a target position by using a motion vector together with pixel data. Additionally, plural items of pixel data located in the space directional periphery with respect to second positions obtained by performing motion compensation on the first positions by using the motion vector and the pixel data are selected.

By selecting plural items of pixel data with respect to first positions by performing motion compensation on a target position and by selecting plural items of pixel data with respect to second positions obtained by performing motion compensation on the first positions as claimed in claims 1 and 5-7, the claimed invention provides an apparatus, method, medium and program which can convert an image signal containing coding noise into an image signal from

which the coding noise is removed. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 5-7.

Claims 1-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by *Kondo, et al.*. (WO 02/13512).

Kondo, et al.. appears to disclose in Figure 4A the structure of prediction taps. A subject pixel on a frame Fn along with pixels lying around the subject pixel total 13 pixels, a pixel on the frame Fn-1 specified by the motion vector from the motion vector detection circuit 22 with respect to the subject pixel along with pixels lying around the pixel totaling 13 pixels and a pixel on the frame Fn+1 specified by the motion vector from the motion vector detection circuit 22 with respect to the subject pixel along with pixels lying around the pixel totaling 13 pixels are extracted as being prediction taps [0025]. If, for example, the motion vector between the frame Fn-1 and the frame Fn is (-1, -1) and the motion vector between the frame Fn and the frame Fn+1 is (1,1), with the motion vector between the frame Fn and the frame Fn being naturally (0,0) as shown in Figure 4B, the subject pixel on the frame Fn, a pixel on the frame Fn-1 at a position specified by the motion vector (-1,-1) with respect to the subject pixel and a pixel on the frame Fn+1 at a position specified by the motion vector (1, 1) with respect to the subject pixel, along with each 13 pixels there around, are extracted as being class taps as shown in Figure 4C [0026].

Thus, *Kondo, et al.*. merely discloses in Figure 4C the subject pixel in frame Fn, Fn-1 and Fn+1 along with 13 pixels there around. Nothing in *Kondo, et al.*. shows, teaches or suggests plural items of pixel data located in a space directional periphery with respect to second positions obtained by performing motion compensation on the first positions by using the motion vector and the pixel data as claimed in claims 1 and 5-7. Rather, *Kondo, et al.*. only discloses a subject pixels and frames before and after the subject pixel frame.

Since nothing in *Kondo, et al.*. shows, teaches or suggests selecting pixel data with respect to second positions obtained by performing motion compensation on first positions as claimed in claims 1 and 5-7, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-4 would not have been anticipated by *Kondo, et al.*. within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The prior art of record which is not relied upon, is acknowledged. The references taken singularly or in combination do not anticipate or make obvious the claimed invention.

Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for a reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: September 21, 2009

By: _____
Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
Tel. (202) 292-1530